

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

AVIDEH AMINIAN,

No 3:18-cv-01395-HZ

Plaintiff,

v.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
JAMES HAWTHORNE PROPERTY,

OPINION & ORDER

Defendants

HERNANDEZ, District Judge:

Pro se Plaintiff Avidesh Aminian brings action against Defendants "Social Security Corp." and "James Hawthorne Landlord." In a September 14, 2018 Opinion & Order, I granted Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. ECF 8. I also set out the standards for dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915, and explained that the Complaint failed to articulate a discernable claim or establish a basis for diversity or federal question jurisdiction. I explained the legal requirements for sufficiently stating a claim and for alleging federal jurisdiction. Although I dismissed the Complaint, I granted Plaintiff leave to amend.

Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint on September 19, 2018. ECF 10. She alleges that she is filing a lawsuit "to win a lawsuit" against the property of "Mr. Smith (James Hawthorne (SW Portland)." Am. Compl. at p. 1. She makes statements about paying for an attorney to collect a judgment, being a victim, and taking money. *Id.* There are other statements regarding her privacy and having the ability to go outside without problems. *Id.* She alleges something about "Bank Banner" and a police report, although it is hard to make sense of her statements. *Id.* at p. 2. She mentions fraud. *Id.* She again mentions a police report on the third page and notes that the James Hawthorne property "is finding me as victim for health care." *Id.* at p. 3.


For the reasons explained in the September 14, 2018 Opinion, Plaintiff again fails to state a cognizable claim or establish a basis for federal jurisdiction. I have previously advised Plaintiff of the deficiencies in her pleading and have allowed her to amend her Complaint. Her Amended Complaint shows no attempt to satisfy the pleading or jurisdictional requirements sufficient to sustain the action. At this point, it is clear that further amendment would be futile. Thus, I dismiss the Amended Complaint with prejudice.

CONCLUSION

The Amended Complaint [10] is dismissed with prejudice and without leave to amend. Plaintiffs's renewed motion for appointment of counsel [11] is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 27 day of September, 2018


Marco A. Hernandez
United States District Judge